

COMPLAINTIN THE DISTRICT COURT OF MOBILE COUNTY, ALABAMAMICHAEL DEWAYNE ANDERSON, ET AL.,
COMPLAINANT(s)CASE NUMBER #V.
HERMAN YOUNG THOMAS ET AL.,
DEFENDANTJURISDICTION:

THIS HONORABLE MOBILE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT, AND THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE HAS JURISDICTION TO REMOVE THE SAID DEFENDANT, HERMAN YOUNG THOMAS FROM HIS HELD POSITION AS JUDGE, PURSUANT TITLE § 36-11-1(A)(6)(1)(2)(3) AND 42 U.S.C.S. § 1985(2)(3), 42 U.S.C.S. § 1981(A)(C), AND ETHICAL VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO THE FOLLOWING ETHICAL VIOLATIONS:

CHARGE #1. FAILURE TO CONDUCT HIMSELF AT ALL TIMES, IN A MANNER THAT PROMOTES PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE INTEGRITY AND THE IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY: CANON 2(A):

CHARGE #2. FAILURE TO AVOID CONDUCT PREJUDICIAL TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE WHICH BRINGS THE JUDICIAL OFFICE INTO DISPUTE: SHOWING ACTIONS OF ILL-ADVISED AND UNJUSTIFIED: CANON 2(B):

CHARGE #3. FAILURE TO DISQUALIFY HIMSELF WHERE IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED: CANON 3(C)(1):

CHARGE #4. PARTIALITY, FAVORING ONE SIDE, PERSONALLY INVOLVED, BIAS, UNEQUITABLE, AND UNFAIR AND UNJUST:

CHARGE #5. UNDERMINING THE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE, AND ACTING PARTIAL TO ONE SIDE:

Exhibit-A (2)

Charge # 6. Showing bad faith - The conscious doing of a wrong, because of dishonest purposes or moral obliquity: it is different from the negative idea of negligence in that it contemplates a state of mind affirmatively operating with furtive design or ill-will: *Steth v. Williams*, 120 App. 367 N.E. 2d 1120, 1124: An intentionally tort which results from breach of duty imposed as consequence of relationship established by contract: *Matter of Sheffield*, 465 So. 2d 360, 350 Cal. 1984).

Complainant Michael Dewayne Anderson brings criminal charges against the defendant Herman Young Thomas, in here as he is no longer protected by qualified immunity. Due to the fact that the complainant Michael Dewayne Anderson submits his affidavit, along with others, that Herman Young Thomas has demanded sexual favors for justice in the courtroom, see Exhibits #1, 2, 3 and 4, attached to this complaint. Under color of law, in any event, it was never designed to cover a case for wrongful use of power by a state official, reference by the dissenters being made to the dissent in *Screws v. United States* (1945), 335 U.S. 91, 89 L. Ed. 1495, 65 S. Ct. 1031, 162 ALR. 1330, also see *Williams v. United States*, (1951) 341 US 97, 95 L. Ed. 758, 71 S. Ct. 581, infra § 6(a), stating, under color of state law within the meaning of the substantive section of the civil rights statutes meant miss use of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer was clothed with the authority of state law, and applied to any deprivation of a constitutional right. The complainant demands that the defendant Herman Young Thomas be arrested, and brought before a court on charges contained in this complaint and affidavits:


Notary Public

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael D. Anderson

Sworn And Subscribed before me this 27th day of November 2002:

NOV 7, 2003
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES